DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 213 777 UD 022 114

AUTHOR	Elliott, Gary L.; Murray, Wayne R.
TITLE	Evaluation of the 1979-80 Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) Basic Project, Bilingual Education Component.
INSTITUTION	Dallas Independent School District, Tex. Dept. of Research and Evaluation.
REPORT NO	EE80-319-31-09
PUB DATE	Sep 80
NOTE	10p.; For related documents, see UD 022 115.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Achievement Gains; *Bilingual Education; Educationally Disadvantaged; *Improvement Programs; Intermediate Grades; Junior High Schools; Language Proficiency; Program Evaluation; Scores; Spanish Speaking; *Teacher Role
IDENTIFIERS	Dallas Independent School District TX; Emergency School Aid Act 1972; Limited English Speaking

ABSTRACT

This report presents the results of the evaluation of a bilingual education component implemented through the Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) in the Dallas (Texas) Independent School District. Under the program, multicultural bilingual instruction was provided in 13 schools. Twenty-two percent, as opposed to a projected 60 percent, of the students met or exceeded the program's achievement objectives, as measured by the "Inter-American Series: Test of General Ability." Similarly, the objective of 100 percent of the resource teachers providing supplementary assistance was not met. Parent involvement activities were implemented as designed. In the report, test scores and gains are given by school and level of test, and distribution of pre- and posttest scores are appended. It is suggested that the failure of the Dallas ESAA program to meet its objectives reflects the fact that the objectives were too stringent to be realistic. (JCD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED213777

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

DEPARTMENT
OF
RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

UD 022 114

dallas independent school district

Linus Wright, *General Superintendent*

Dallas Independent School District
Linus Wright, General Superintendent

Accountability and Development Division
William J. Webster
Associate Superintendent

Department of Research and Evaluation
C. LaVor Lym
Deputy Assistant Superintendent

EVALUATION OF THE 1979-80 EMERGENCY SCHOOL AID ACT (ESAA) BASIC PROJECT, BILINGUAL EDUCATION COMPONENT

EE80-319-31-09

Gary L. Elliott
and
Wayne R. Murray

Approved report of the
Department of Research and Evaluation

C. LaVor Lym

C. LaVor Lym, Ph.D.
Deputy Assistant Superintendent
Research and Evaluation

William J. Webster

William J. Webster, Ph.D.
Associate Superintendent
Accountability and Development

Dallas, Texas
September 1980

Evaluation of the 1979-80 Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) Basic Project, Bilingual Education Component

Evaluators: Gary L. Elliott and Wayne R. Murray

Objectives of the Program: During the 1979-80 school year, the Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) Basic Project funded a bilingual component for eligible students in intermediate schools of the Dallas Independent School District (DISD). The primary objectives of the ESAA program were (a) to meet the needs incident to the elimination of minority group isolation and (b) to aid school children in overcoming the possible educational disadvantages of minority group isolation. The bilingual component was designed to meet the need of the DISD by providing supplementary bilingual instruction to students in desegregated schools who were of limited English-speaking proficiency.

Purpose of the Evaluation: The evaluation of this project was designed to delineate, obtain, and provide useful, descriptive, and informative feedback for future decision making. This report was written to summarize information concerning the implementation of the project during the 1979-80 school year as well as to provide summative information for the determination of the degree to which the program attained the stated objectives.

Sample: All identified limited-English-proficiency students at the designated schools were eligible to participate in this program. Eligibility in the program was not dependent on whether or not the student was being bused for desegregation purposes. Students were eligible to participate even if their dominant language was English. There were 12 intermediate schools serving 516 students in the program as reflected by the following data.

Schools	Students Served
Burnet	32
Foster	121
Rogers	93
Lakewood	44
Reinhardt	25
Rowe	27
Sanger	28
Adams	34
Blanton	10
Burleson	30
Hawthorne	15
Ireland	23
Rylie	34
Total	516

Evaluation Design: A sample of students was given the Inter-American Series: Test of General Ability or its Spanish version Prueba de Habilidad General in a one-group pretest and posttest design. The pretest was given in October and November and the posttest in May. Students were tested in the language and level of test suggested by their teacher. In several cases, the level suggested by the teacher did not correspond to the performance level of the student. Scores for students in the program who were tested on the preschool level test were eliminated from the analysis. Students who took the level 4 test (for grades 7-8) as a pretest were posttested on level 3 and their pretest scores converted to the equivalent score on level 3 for statistical analysis. Also scores for students who scored low on the test indicating only random or chance answers were deleted from the analysis.

Questionnaires which were mailed out and those that were completed by resource teachers during staff development activities after the end of the school year provided additional information that was employed in this study. Direct observation was done in five of the schools and information collected during these observations is also included.

Major Evaluation Questions and Results:

1. Was the Bilingual Education component implemented as designed?

   A multicultural/bilingual basic instruction component was implemented at 13 schools. The component provided supplementary bilingual instruction for students who were of limited English proficiency. The students received instructional reinforcement in the areas of language arts, mathematics, social studies, and science utilizing the language in which the student was most proficient. Developing in the student a positive self-concept through the use of a multicultural approach was an integral part of the curriculum. Where staff was limited, the curriculum, at a minimum, consisted of English-as-a-Second-Language material.

   All eight of the resource teacher positions and six of the eight aide positions were filled for most of the school year. Project management speculated that the shortage of aides in this program might be attributed to the District's low pay scale.

2. Were the objectives of the component attained? Did 60% of those students tested exhibit a 20% gain in general skills, as measured by the Inter-American Series: Test of General Ability or Prueba de Habilidad General, and the remaining 40% show a gain of 10% in general skills on the same test?

   This objective was not met. There were 269 students given the pretest and posttest and of those, only 61 (22.7%) had an increase equal to or greater than 20% of the pretest score.

The percent of increase for each level of the test is presented in Table 1. The objective was not met on any of the test levels. The percent of increase by language of the test is presented in Table 2. The objective was not met in either of the languages, with Spanish showing slightly larger increases than English.

The percent increase by school is presented in Table 3. None of the individual schools met the stated objective. The school coming closest to the objective was Rogers with 38.5% of those tested showing a gain of 20% or larger on the posttest. The remaining students did not meet the objective of a 20% increase as shown in Tables 1, 2, and 3.

It is the opinion of the evaluation staff that the objectives for this program were unrealistic. Table 4 is presented to show the distribution of scores in the pretest and posttest. While there were gains in posttest scores, the one-group pretest/posttest design has the possibility of several confounding extraneous variables that could jeopardize the internal validity of the gains. Some other variables which offer plausible hypothesis explaining the increases, in addition to the effects of the program, are history, maturation, and the effect of testing itself.

3. Did 100% of the resource teachers provide the supplementary assistance specified in the activities section of the proposal?

Questionnaires concerning the proposed activities were completed by all eight of the resource teachers in this component and were returned to the evaluation staff. All of the resource teachers reported they were helping in the identification of special needs of ESAA bilingual students and were also helping in the implementation of a prescriptive program after the students' needs were diagnosed. Six of the respondents had helped in the implementation of appropriate classroom management. One of the resource teachers indicated she was not helping in the evaluation of student progress in a team effort with the classroom teacher; the other seven indicated they were doing this during the project period. Five of the resource teachers indicated they had assisted in acquiring multicultural materials, one said she did not help acquire any such materials, and the other two did not answer this question. Four of the resource teachers stated they helped the classroom teachers and aides in the development of instructional materials relevant to ESAA bilingual objectives. Two stated they did not do this, and two did not provide enough information in their answer to determine if they were performing this activity.

Table 1

Percent Increase by Level of Test
of General Ability Scores

Percent of Increase	Level of Test: One N	One %	Two N	Two %	Three N	Three %	Total N	Total %
Less than 10%	20	54.1	46	57.5	82	53.9	148	55.0
10% to 19.9%	7	18.9	21	26.3	32	21.1	60	22.3
20% or Greater	10	27.0	13	16.3	38	25.0	61	22.7
Total	37	100.0	80	100.0	152	100.0	269	100.0

Table 2

Percent of Gains in General Ability
in English and Spanish

Gain	English N	English %	Spanish N	Spanish %
Less than 10%	143	57.4	5	26.3
10% to 19.9%	52	20.9	7	36.8
20% or Greater	54	21.7	7	36.8
Total	249	100.0	19	100.0

Table 3

Percent Increase in General Ability
By School

	Increase					
	Less than 10%		10% to 19.9%		20% or Greater	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Adams, J.Q.	7	46.7	7	46.7	1	6.7
Blanton	4	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Burnet	7	87.5	0	0.0	1	12.5
Burleson	21	80.8	2	7.7	3	11.5
Foster	40	70.2	12	21.1	5	8.8
Hawthorne	4	50.0	1	12.5	3	37.5
Ireland	18	60.0	5	16.7	7	23.3
Lakewood	12	44.4	8	29.6	7	25.9
Rogers	13	33.3	11	28.2	15	38.5
Sanger	6	37.5	4	25.0	6	37.5
Reinhardt	2	40.0	2	40.0	1	20.0
Rylie	10	55.6	4	22.2	4	22.2

Table 4

Distribution of Pre- and Posttest Scores

Range of Scores	Pretest N	Pretest %	Posttest N	Posttest %
Levels One and Two (N=117)				
0-39	3	2.6	1	1.0
40-49	7	6.0	0	0.0
50-59	14	12.0	11	9.4
60-69	51	43.6	34	29.1
70-79	34	29.1	51	43.6
80-89	8	6.8	16	13.7
90-99	0	0.0	4	3.4
Level Three (N=152)				
0-59	7	4.6	3	2.0
60-69	15	9.9	11	7.2
70-79	26	17.1	16	10.5
80-89	32	21.0	23	15.1
90-99	27	17.8	30	19.7
100-109	29	19.1	39	25.7
110-119	13	8.5	23	15.1
120-150	3	2.0	7	4.6

The objective of having 100% of the resource teachers provide all the supplementary assistance specified in the proposal was not met. In addition, the shortage of bilingual teachers made some of the activities difficult to complete.

4. As specified in the proposal, did 100% of the teacher aides provide the supplementary assistance specified in the activities?

   The information contained in the answer to this question was provided by questionnaires which were sent to all six of the teacher aides and were returned by only four to the Department of Research and Evaluation. All of the aides who returned the questionnaire were providing small group instruction with the average size group of three and spending additional time working with below grade level students; two were encouraging cross-peer tutoring and assisting the teachers in developing creative instructional materials. Based on the information of these four aides, it seems the objective of 100% of the aides performing all of the activities was not met by this program. As discussed above, the criterion of 100% does not allow for any error and seems rather unrealistic.

5. Were the parent involvement activities listed in the proposal implemented as designed?

   The parent involvement activities were implemented in this program. All the parents of students in the ESAA Basic Bilingual Component were given the opportunity to participate in activities wich were designed so that unfamiliarity with English was not a barrier. The parents were given the opportunity to provide input and to review the application for the next year's program through Parent Advisory Committee meetings and school meetings. A newsletter was published once during the year in May by parents, facilitators, resource teachers, aides, and the administration.

   Parents of students in the program were given opportunities to volunteer in the classroom or for field trip activities. Several of the schools involved the parents in the sewing of costumes, cooking of food, and transportation of students for the Cinco de Mayo celebration for which there were school assemblies. These assemblies were planned so that all students could learn the significance of the day and be exposed to some Hispanic cultural activities.

Additional Information:

Elliott, G. L. and Murray, W. R. Evaluation of the 1979-80 Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) Bilingual Education Project (EE80-329-31-09). Dallas, Texas: Dallas Independent School District, Department of Research and Evaluation, September 1980.